

Remarks/Request for Reconsideration

Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given this application. Reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-14, and 17-39 are now pending in this application, of which Claims 1, 12, 22, and 31 are independent claims.

At pages 3-24, the Office Action rejects “Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-14, 17, 19-22, 24-26, 28, 30-35, 37, and 39 Claims 5, 8, 15, 18, 23, and 32” (presumably meaning Claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-26, 28, 30-35, 37, and 39) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinonen et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0112789) in view of Rockwell (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/011699). At pages 24-25, the Office Action rejects Claims 27 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinonen et al. and Rockwell in view of Bjorklund et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0046184). At pages 25-26, the Office Action rejects Claims 29 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinonen et al. and Rockwell in view of Belmont (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0127204). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

All of the independent claims, Claims 1, 12, 22, and 31, were previously amended to incorporate the elements of, or elements similar to those of, now-cancelled Claim 16, which was indicated as containing allowable subject matter. The indication of allowable subject matter corresponding to those elements has been withdrawn in the present Office Action, and Applicants respectfully disagree with the withdrawal of this indication and maintain that all remaining claims are allowable over the cited references.

In particular, the independent claims include a recitation that a message sent to a mobile device includes *an instruction to the mobile device* to forward the message to the server. The Office Action asserts, e.g., at pages 11-12, that paragraph 55 of Heinonen et al. teaches or discloses this feature. Paragraph 55 includes the statement, “The mobile wireless device 100 uses the information in the server response message 435 to contact the server over the Internet to download web pages or to conduct other server operations.” A review of the contents of message 435, as described in paragraphs 54 and 55 and as shown in Figs. 1D, 1F, and 1G, reveals no such instruction in message 435. Message 435 is shown in an excerpt from Fig. 1D shown below (note that message 435 is the same in all three figures).

LOCAL/ GLOBAL 557	PRIORITY 558	TIMER 560	DISPLAY MODE 562	CONTENT 564	TITLE 566	BIT MAP 568
-------------------------	-----------------	--------------	------------------------	----------------	--------------	-------------------

SOFT KEY_1 570	SOFT KEY_2 572	SOFT KEY_3 574	LOCATION 576	URL 578	SERVICE TYPE 580	GSM HANDOVER ADDR. 582	END 584
----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	-----------------	------------	------------------------	------------------------------	------------

As shown here, message 435 contains various types of information, but *none of the information in message 435 corresponds to the claimed instruction to the mobile device to forward the message to the server*. This is further verified by a review of the discussion of message 435 in paragraph [0055].

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-14, and 17-39 are allowable over the cited references, and withdrawal of their rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants may not have presented all possible arguments or have refuted the characterizations of either the claims or the prior art as found in the Office Action.

However, the lack of such arguments or refutations is not intended to act as a waiver of such arguments or as concurrence with such characterizations.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the above remarks address all of the grounds for objection and rejection and that the application is in condition for allowance. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply and reconsideration of this application.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey W. Gluck/

Date: January 24, 2008

Jeffrey W. Gluck, Ph.D.
Registration No. 44,457
Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz LLP
1875 Eye Street NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: 202-331-7111
Direct Dial: 202-572-0322
Facsimile: 202-293-6229

JWG/bms
CB-583386